25

BEFORE THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

In the Matter of

DIEGO G. CARDENAS, M.D.

Holder of License No. **19750**For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine In the State of Arizona.

Board Case No. MD-06-0055A

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

(Letter of Reprimand)

The Arizona Medical Board ("Board") considered this matter at its public meeting on February 7, 2007. Diego G. Cardenas, M.D., ("Respondent") appeared before the Board with legal counsel Carolyn Armer Holden for a formal interview pursuant to the authority vested in the Board by A.R.S. § 32-1451(H). The Board voted to issue the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order after due consideration of the facts and law applicable to this matter.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 2. Respondent is the holder of License No. 19750 for the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 3. The Board initiated case number MD-06-0055A after the investigation of another physician revealed Respondent's possible unprofessional conduct in his care and treatment of a thirty-one year-old pregnant patient ("RL"). RL presented to the emergency room on September 13, 2003 complaining of migraine headache and decreased fetal movement. Respondent's evaluation revealed RL's symptoms included chills and he noted her to have an ill appearance. Fetal movement was evaluated by monitoring, which showed a reactive test. RL was afebrile with a temperature of 96.2, tachycardic and had an abnormal urinalysis. Respondent treated RL with Demerol and Phenergan for the migraine headache and discharged her. RL returned to the

emergency room the next day complaining of dysuria, frequency, flank pain, fever and chills. RL was found to be in septic shock due to pyelonephritis. RL was admitted to the hospital, but died on September 18, 2003 from septic shock, pyelonephritis secondary to Klebsiella pneumonia.

- 4. Respondent is currently employed as a family practice physician and no longer works in emergency medicine. According to Respondent, although chills normally represent the presence of infection, RL said the chills were part of her migraine symptoms. RL's chills could have been involuntary muscle contractions of the body's attempt to raise the body temperature in response to a stress, such as infection or sepsis. RL's expected date of confinement was December 30, 2003 and she reported decreased fetal movement. Decreased fetal movement is a red flag for a patient at RL's stage of gestation.
- 5. Respondent documented that RL "started with chills and flu-like symptoms. Positive nausea. No vomiting." Respondent did not order a complete blood count, but did order fetal monitoring to document how the baby was doing, and a urinalysis to check for the presence of proteinuria. Respondent ordered the urinalysis as a clean-catch urine. The urinalysis had white cells too numerous to count and had 10 to 15 epithelial cells and many bacteria. Respondent concluded from the urinalysis that RL did not have early preeclampsia and that the urine was contaminated because RL had no symptoms of urinary tract infection. Generally, a pregnant patient with an asymptomatic urinary tract infection is at higher risk for complications than a non-pregnant patient.
- 6. Respondent was taught that from an obstetric standpoint the treatment of an asymptomatic urinary tract infection in pregnancy is based on the urine culture, not on the urinalysis. A well-respected text on emergency medicine¹ states a urinary tract infection in a pregnant patient poses special problems that, if left untreated, the asymptomatic bacteria may

¹ The text the Board is referring to is authored by Judith E. Tintinalli, M.D., M.S., and is entitled *Emergency Medicine: A Comprehensive Study Guide.*

21

22

23

24

25

1

progress to symptomatic urinary tract infection and pyelonephritis. The text also states this is the single area in which the treatment of asymptomatic bacteria is indicated.

- 7. Respondent's training in emergency medicine consisted of a lot of overlap between his training in family medicine and his training in emergency medicine. In addition, Respondent has experience, mainly through the United States Air Force, in working in emergency departments and he has certifications in Advanced Cardiac Life Support, Advanced Trauma Life Support, and Pediatric Advanced Life Support. Respondent believed RL's urine was contaminated because of his training that clean-catch urines were not to be trusted for determining the presence or absence of bacteriuria. Respondent was responsible for doing what was reasonable and prudent to resolve the issue of a lab test that may be abnormal, but he thought may be contaminated. Respondent did not believe RL had a urinary tract infection because she had no flank tenderness, no suprapubic tenderness, no complaints of dysuria, frequency - all the things she had the next day. When the result of a test yields several possibilities - contamination versus urinary tract infection - Respondent has a responsibility to resolve the issue. Respondent believes he resolved it by getting a CAT specimen. The standard in the emergency room is to do a quick in-and-out catheter to obtain an accurate urine specimen. Respondent believed he had no reason to obtain such a specimen.
- 8. RL was tachycardic with a normal blood pressure when she presented to the emergency room, but by the time Respondent got to her cardiac examination and listened to her heart rate, the tachycardia had resolved and he documented in the record that she had no tachycardia and her heart sounds were normal. According to Respondent, RL was on a monitor that took her blood pressure and her heart rate once per hour. Monitoring strips are not part of the record and Respondent does not know what happened to them. The nurse's intake note documents RL's heart rate in the 120s abnormal. Pain, stress, anxiety, fever and hypotension can cause an abnormal heart rate and RL had fever. It is not typical for a patient who is

experiencing a severe migraine to have a heart rate in the 120s simply due to pain. An emergency room physician has an obligation to address abnormal vital signs either in follow-up or some other fashion. Respondent believed he addressed the abnormal vital signs when he documented RL's heart rate was normal when he examined her. However, Respondent did not document what RL's heart rate was when he examined her. He simply circled "normal" on her chart. Respondent's discharge diagnosis was "migraine improved."

- 9. The standard of care for a pregnant patient who reports decreased fetal movement, presents with chills, sweats, tachycardia, is documented as ill-appearing and has an abnormal urinalysis and abnormal vital signs requires the physician to perform further evaluation.
- 10. Respondent deviated from the standard of care when he did not further evaluate RL's abnormal urinalysis and abnormal vital signs.
- 11. RL's diagnosis of urinary tract infection was delayed ultimately leading to the demise of RL and her fetus.
- 12. A physician is required to maintain adequate medical records. An adequate medical record means a legible record containing, at a minimum, sufficient information to identify the patient, support the diagnosis, justify the treatment, accurately document the results, indicate advice and cautionary warnings provided to the patient and provide sufficient information for another practitioner to assume continuity of the patient's care at any point in the course of treatment. A.R.S. § 32-1401(2). Respondent's records do not meet this standard.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Arizona Medical Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over Respondent.
- 2. The Board has received substantial evidence supporting the Findings of Fact described above and said findings constitute unprofessional conduct or other grounds for the Board to take disciplinary action.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

3. The conduct and circumstances described above constitutes unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(e) ("[f]ailing or refusing to maintain adequate records on a patient"); and A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(q) ("[a]ny conduct or practice that is or might be harmful or dangerous to the health of the patient or the public.").

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

Respondent is issued a Letter of Reprimand for delay in diagnosis and treatment of a pregnant patient with bacteriuria and for inadequate medical records.

RIGHT TO PETITION FOR REHEARING OR REVIEW

Respondent is hereby notified that he has the right to petition for a rehearing or review. The petition for rehearing or review must be filed with the Board's Executive Director within thirty (30) days after service of this Order, A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(B). The petition for rehearing or review must set forth legally sufficient reasons for granting a rehearing or review. A.A.C. R4-16-103. Service of this order is effective five (5) days after date of mailing. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(C). If a petition for rehearing or review is not filed, the Board's Order becomes effective thirty-five (35) days after it is mailed to Respondent.

Respondent is further notified that the filing of a motion for rehearing or review is required to preserve any rights of appeal to the Superior Court.

DATED this day of April 2007.



THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

Executive Director

1		
2	ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed day of April, 2007 with:	this
3	Arizona Medical Board 9545 East Doubletree Ranch Ro	ad
4	Scottsdale, Arizona 85258	
5	Executed copy of the foregoing mailed by U.S. Mail this	
6	ay of April, 2007, to:	
7	Carolyn Armer Holden Holden & Armer, P.C.	
8	6101 South Rural Road – Suite 1 Tempe, Arizona 82583-2910	118
9	Diego G. Cardenas, M.D.	
10	Address of Record	
11	Music	
1,2	Turker Many	<u> </u>
13		-9 1
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	 .	